

Remarks/Arguments

Claim Status

Claim 1 is amended herein. Claims 11-14 are cancelled, without prejudice to Applicant's right to file a divisional application directed to the subject matter of said cancelled claims. New Claim 15 is added by way of this Amendment.

Claims 1-10 and 15 thus remain pending in the application.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. Section 112

Applicant traverses the rejection of Claims 1-10 under 35 U.S.C. Section 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections are respectfully requested in view of the claim amendments and arguments set forth herein.

The Examiner contends that Claim 1 is indefinite in that it is unclear what the amounts of the components recited in the claim are based on. Although Applicant does not agree with this contention, in the interest of advancing prosecution of the application Applicant has amended Claim 1 to recite that the weight % of each individual component is based on the sum total of the individual components. Support for this amendment is found at line 15 on page 11 of the specification.

The Examiner further contends that the metes and bounds of "pulverulent organic polymer" in Claim 1 are indeterminate in scope. Although Applicant does not agree with this contention, in the interest of advancing examination of the

application Claim 1 has been amended to recite that the “pulverulent saccharide” and “reactive polymeric additives” are different from the “pulverulent organic polymer”.

Additionally, the Examiner contends that Claim 1 is indefinite because it is unclear if or how the (blocked)(microencapsulated) polyisocyanates distinguish over the (blocked)(microencapsulated)diisocyanates. While not agreeing with this contention, in the interest of advancing prosecution of the application Claim 1 has been amended to recite only “polyisocyanates”, “blocked polyisocyanates”, and “microencapsulated polyisocyanates”. However, Applicant wishes to make of record his understanding and belief that such terms encompass “diisocyanates”, “blocked diisocyanates” and “microencapsulated diisocyanates”, respectively. Nothing herein is intended or should be construed to be a disclaimer of any claim scope as it pertains to the possible inclusion of “diisocyanates”, “blocked diisocyanates” or “microencapsulated diisocyanates” within the Markush group of reactive additives set forth in Claim 1.

The Examiner also contends that it is unclear in Claim 1 if or how the generic “hydroxy-functional additives” distinguish over the antecedently recited saccharide components. Although Applicant disagrees with this contention, in the interest of advancing examination of the present application Claim 1 has been amended to recite that the hydroxy-functional additives are hydroxy-functional additives other than the pulverulent saccharides.

In addition, the Examiner contends that it is unclear in Claim 1 how or if the generic “amino-functional additives” distinguish over the polyaminoamides,

diamines and polyamines. Applicant wishes to point out that the Markush group of reactive additives set forth in Claim 1 does not recite "polyaminoamides, diamines and polyamines" per se, but rather the "condensation products of epoxy resins" with such compounds. Polyaminoamides, diamines and polyamines react with epoxy resins through their amino groups, meaning that the condensation products would not necessarily still contain reactive amine functional groups. However, in the interest of furthering prosecution of the present application, Claim 1 has been amended to recite "amino-functional additives other than condensation products of epoxy resins and polyaminoamides and/or polyamines".

The Examiner further contends that in Claim 1 it is unclear if or how the generic " β -dicarbonyl compounds" distinguish over the dicarboxylic acids and dicarboxylic anhydrides. Although Applicant does not agree with this contention, Claim 1 has been amended to recite " β -dicarbonyl compounds other than said dicarboxylic acids and di- and tricarboxylic acid anhydrides" in order to advance examination of the present application.

The Examiner is invited to contact Applicant's Attorney at the number shown below in the event the instantly presented claim amendments and arguments do not resolve all issues currently outstanding in this application.

Henkel Corporation
2200 Renaissance Boulevard, Suite 200
Gulph Mills, PA 19406

Respectfully submitted,



Stephen D. Harper
(Reg. No. 33,243)
Attorney for Applicants
(610) 278-4927